



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

50

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,673	02/22/2002	Venkataraman Ramanathan	213822	2113

45373 7590 08/10/2005

MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP (MICROSOFT)
233 SOUTH WACKER DRIVE
6300 SEARS TOWER
CHICAGO, IL 60606

EXAMINER

CHANG, JUNGWON

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/081,673

Applicant(s)

RAMANATHAN ET AL.

Examiner

Jungwon Chang

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-21 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 10/15/02.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicants elect claims of Group I, claims 1-12 without traverse. Claims 1-12 are presented for examination.
2. Claim 9 is objected to because it is not clearly to understand what "BDI" stands for in line 4.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chase et al (US 5,944,780), hereinafter Chase, in view of Dujari et al. (US 6,119,153), hereinafter Dujari.

5. As to claims 1 and 7, Chase discloses the invention substantially as claimed, including a method of serving target directory information, in a computing environment comprising a server computer (directory server, server, fig. 1) hosting the target directory (16, 160, fig. 1), a client computer (12, fig. 1) communicably linkable to the

Art Unit: 2154

server computer (col. 5, lines 31-46), the client computer hosting an application (browser or other client software; col. 5, lines 54-59) and a directory cache (local cache; 20, fig. 1), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving from the application a benign request for information relating to a target file potentially contained in the target directory (col. 3, lines 21-30; col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 5; col. 6, lines 64-67);

inspecting the directory cache to determine whether a valid enumeration of the contents of the target directory is cached in the directory cache (col. 4, lines 3-11; col. 5, lines 60-61; col. 6, lines 61-62; col. 7, lines 3-6);

forwarding the request for information to the server if it is determined that a valid enumeration of the contents of the target directory is not cached in the directory cache (col. 5, line 62 – col. 6, line 13);

inspecting the directory cache to determine whether the target file is contained in the enumeration of the contents of the target directory, if it is determined that a valid enumeration of the contents of the target directory is cached in the directory cache (col. 4, lines 3-11; col. 5, lines 60-61);

returning to the application an indication that the target file does not exist in the target directory if it is determined that the target file is not contained in the enumeration of the contents of the target directory (col. 6, lines 6-13 and 33-37); and

if it is determined that the target file is contained in the enumeration of the contents of the target directory, serving the request for information from the directory cache (col. 3, lines 17-30; col. 4, lines 3-11), and otherwise sending the request to the

Art Unit: 2154

server and passing a response from the server to application (col. 6, lines 6-13; col. 7, lines 44-47).

6. Chase discloses marking the entry corresponding to data as unavailable in the cache directory (col. 6, lines 30-35; entry or labeling it "unavailable"; col. 7, lines 28-32). However, Chase does not specifically disclose the valid entry for the target file contains sufficient information to satisfy the request. Dujari discloses if the valid entry for the target file contains sufficient information to satisfy the request (file identify; cache directory; file status; 86, fig. 5; fig. 7; col. 8, lines 1-10; col. 9, line 52 – col. 10, line 50). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chase and Dujari because Dujari's valid indication having sufficient information would rapidly determine the requested file should be retrieved from where it lies (Dujari, col. 8, lines 1-10).

7. As to claim 2, Chase discloses receiving from the application a benign request for information relating to a target file potentially contained in the target directory further comprises receiving a request for read-only access (the request is inherently indicated by the client that it will only be performing read-only operation; col. 3, lines 21-30; col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 5; col. 6, lines 64-67).

8. As to claim 3, Chase discloses receiving the benign request from an input/output manager that received the request from the application (input/output controller

Art Unit: 2154

inherently receives the request from the browser; col. 3, lines 21-30; col. 5, line 54 – col. 6, line 5; col. 6, lines 64-67).

9. As to claim 4, Chase discloses caching a response to the request for information in the directory cache (col. 1, lines 38-43; col. 3, lines 21-30).

10. As to claims 5 and 6, Chase does not specifically disclose expiring the directory cache upon the passage of an expiration period. However, Dujari discloses expiring the directory cache upon the passage of an expiration period (col. 10, lines 1-5 and 44-45; col. 11, lines 9-36). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Chase and Dujari because Dujari's expiry information with each file would improve cache management by appropriately downloading new content after determining the current content is expired (Dujari, col. 11, lines 9-17).

11. As to claims 8 and 9, Chase discloses receiving a request for access to the target file whereby the request if granted would allow the application to modify the last modified time of the target file (last modified time of the file is inherently changed when the file is updated; col. 2, lines 27-34; col. 4, line 67 – col. 5, line 1).

12. As to claim 10, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 3 above.

Art Unit: 2154

13. As to claim 11, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 5 above.

14. As to claim 12, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in claim 6 above.

Conclusion

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Yen, US 6,904,455, Gampper et al, patent 6,502,106, Hesselink et al, 2005/0144186, Chu et al, patent 6,006,331 disclose a method and system for efficiently delivery of data to local client machine, thereby amount of data delivery over the network from the remote server to the local client is reduced.

16. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jungwon Chang whose telephone number is 571-272-3960. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 (Monday-Friday).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2154

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'JWC' followed by a stylized flourish.

JWC
August 5, 2005